

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 of the subject application are currently pending and have been rejected by the Examiner. In the accompanying amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 6-18, 23-29. Support for the amendments of the claims may be found in the written description, claims, and drawings, of the application as originally filed. On account of the foregoing listed support for the amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action mailed July 28, 2004, the Examiner objected to some of the claims on account of minor informalities contained in those claims. By virtue of the accompanying amendment, it is respectfully submitted that the informalities have been corrected and accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdrawn his objection to the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 37 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-29 Under 37 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Howard, et al (US 6,678,731). Applicants traverse.

Claim 1 as amended includes the following limitations:

A method of using a mobile communications device to access an on-line service provided by a network server, the method comprising:
accessing a proxy server based service in order to obtain information required by the network server in order to process a request to the on-line service, wherein the request to the on-line service is sent via a secure connection previously established between the mobile communications device and the network server;
and
sending the information to the network server via the secure connection with the network server.

(Amended Claim 1, emphasis added).

Howard describes a system that determines whether to grant a user (client computer system) access to a network server. In the system of Howard, prior to granting access to the network server, the network server authenticates the user by sending an authentication request to an authentication server. The authentication server determines

whether the user was already authenticated by the authentication server. If the user is authenticated by the authentication server, then the network server is notified that the user is authenticated through the use of an authentication ticket, and the network server grants the user access. In the system of Howard, the authentication request to the authentication server cannot be “*in order to obtain information required by the network server in order to process a request that is sent to the network server via a secure connection previously established between the client computer system and the network server*”, as recited in Claim 1. The reason for this is that no connection between the client computer system and the network server is possible until the network server authenticates the client computer system and in order to authenticate the client computer system, the network server requires authentication information from the authentication server. Thus, in the system of Howard, the authentication server is not accessed in order to obtain information required by the network server in order to process a request to the network server sent via a secure connection previously established with the network server.

Moreover, Howard fails to teach or suggest that a secure connection is established between the client computer system and the network server. Further, Howard fails to disclose that the client computer system may be a mobile communications device.

On account of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Howard does not teach or suggest all limitations of claim 1, as amended, and therefore cannot anticipate or render claim 1 obvious. Given that claims 2-4 depend on claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard.

As will be seen, each of claims 6-27, and 29 include limitations similar in scope to the above discussed limitation of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 2-27, and 29 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Howard.

Regarding claim 28, this claim includes the following limitations:

A method of using a mobile communications device to access an on-line service provided by a network server, the method comprising:
establishing a first connection between the mobile communications device and a proxy server, the proxy server being configured to provide a proxy based service to the mobile communications device;
establishing a second connection between the mobile communications device and a network server, wherein the second connection is a secure connection that co-exists with the first connection;
sending a request for information to the network server via the secure connection;

receiving a reply to the request from the network server, the reply being indicative of additional information required by the network server in order to process the request;
using the connection between the mobile communications device and the proxy server to access the proxy server based service, the service being able to provide the additional information;
receiving the additional information from the proxy server via the connection therewith; and
sending an enhanced request to the network server via the secure connection therewith, the enhanced request including the additional information.

(Amended Claim 28, emphasis added).

Howard fails to disclose that the client computer system 100 maintains a connection with an affiliate server 104, which connection co-exists with a connection with an authentication server 110. Further, Howard fails to disclose that the connection between the client computer system 100 and the affiliate server 104 is a secure connection.

On account of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Howard fails to teach or suggest all limitations of claim 28, and therefore cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 28.


It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, all rejections have been overcome. All pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner determines that prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Vani Moodley at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: 10/21, 2004


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300